

Attorney Docket No.: 07319-096001  
14 of 16

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 stand rejected over Bornhorst et al. in view of Katagiri et al. and Christie, Jr. et al. This contention is respectfully traversed. To summarize the arguments which are presented below, none of these references teach or suggest an apparatus with multiple units, and with each unit having a memory unit with calibration data that is individual to the unit.

The current rejection is based on Bornhorst et al., which admittedly shows multiple optical devices. Katagiri et al. and Christie, Jr. et al. have been discussed extensively in the previous prosecution. Katagiri et al., for example, teaches storing a table of transmission wavelength versus control parameters. There is no teaching or suggestion that this is individual to the specific optical filter in the optical device. A reasonable reading of Katagiri et al. is that the filter information is the same in each of the plurality of filters.

Therefore, in order to emphasize the patentable distinctions, Claim 1 is amended herewith to specify that the calibration data in the two memory units is different. The calibration data within the memory unit of the first unit therefore represents different information than the calibration data in the second memory unit for the second unit. This

Attorney Docket No.: 07319-096001  
15 of 16

further distinguishes over the hypothetical combination. No fair combination of the prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

The additionally cited reference to Christie, Jr. et al. teaches calibrating using a spectrophotometer. It teaches nothing about individual calibration information for each of a plurality of two different units, as claimed.

None of the cited prior art is in any way suggestive of this subject matter. Therefore, no reasonable combination could be made which would render obvious Claims 1 and 2.

Claims 7 and 8 should be allowable for reasons discussed above, as well as on their own merits. So does teach a calibration table for transmission ratios curve. So's calibration table stores a transmission ratio, and explains that interpolation may be necessary if the transmission ratio falls outside of the values in the table. For these reasons, it becomes apparent that So is a very different kind of calibration system than the present system. So does not have the teaching that the calibration table is a table of points indicating a position on a cut-on curve.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition,

Attorney Docket No.: 07319-096001  
16 of 16

because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply the \$790 RCE fee, and any other applicable charges or credits, to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott C. Harris  
Reg. No. 32,030

Date: March 24, 2006

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
PTO Customer No. 20985  
12390 El Camino Real  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 678-5070 telephone  
(858) 678-5099 facsimile

10613736.doc